



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/272,810	03/19/1999	RICHARD J. CARTER	10982056-1	6119

7590 01/24/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
IPA  
3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
P.O. BOX 272400  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

LUU, LE HIEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application/Control Number: 09/272,810

Art Unit: 2141

Page 1



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**JAN 24 2003**

**Technology Center 2000**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 14

Application Number: 09/272,810

Filing Date: March 19, 1999

Appellant(s): Carter et al.

---

Hugh P. Gortler

For Appellant

### EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 11/20/2002.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Issues**

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

Claims 1-21.

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix A to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

**6,125,401**

**Huras et al.**

**09-2000**

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-21 are rejected under U.S. Code § 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Huras et al. (Huras) patent no. 6,125,401.**
2. As to claim 1, Huras teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of handling a network connection, the network connection including a client-to-server

Art Unit: 2141

channel and a server-to-client channel (col. 4 line 39 – col. 8 line 66), the method comprising:

examining local server information to determine whether the client-to-server channel is still established (Abstract; col. 7 line 57 – col. 8 line 21); and

aborting response preparation to a client request if the client-to-server channel is determined to be no longer established (Abstract; col. 7 line 57 – col. 8 line 67).

3. As to claims 2-7, Huras teach the state of the server-to-client channel is inferred after reading from client-to-server channel; a read buffer is being used to determine whether the client-to-server channel is still established; specific state of the connection is determined by examining local information in the server, "CLOSE\_WAIT" state, interrupt. In addition, Huras teaches that polling is being used despite of some disadvantages (col. 1 lines 43-55, col. 4 line 39 - col. 8 line 66).

4. Claims 8-21 have similar limitations as claims 1-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

**(11) Response to Argument**

(A) Applicant argued that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a server that aborts response preparation to a client request if a client-to-server channel is determined to be no longer established.

As to Point (A), Huras teaches a service provider computer (computer 100, figure 1) for use in a client-server system that can detect abnormal termination of a client process (client process 140 or 150, figure 1). The service provider computer can test condition of a flag (flag 242 or 252, figure 1), and terminate resources (interprocess communication resources 200 or 210, figure 1) allocated to the client process if the flag is not set. Moreover, Huras teaches server process terminate resources allocated to client process to free up system resources if determined that client process has been terminated because of any reason (Abstract; col. 7 line 57 – col. 8 line 67; **specifically col. 8 lines 59-67**).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,



LE HIEN LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 22, 2003

Conferees



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner



MEHMET B. GECKIL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Hugh P. Gortler, Esq.

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400